

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEGALFORCE RAPC WORLDWIDE,  
P.C,

Plaintiff,

v.

LEGALFORCE, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. [22-cv-03724-TLT](#) (AGT)

**DISCOVERY ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 103

The Court denies plaintiff's request for entry of a protective order, without prejudice. Plaintiff's counsel submitted a discovery letter in which he asserted that, after meeting and conferring with opposing counsel "via email and over the phone," he wasn't able to obtain an agreement on the protective order. Dkt. 103 at 1.

The Court isn't convinced that counsel adequately met and conferred about the protective order before plaintiff's counsel brought the issue to the Court's attention. When the parties have a discovery dispute, "[c]ounsel for each party must meet and confer in person or by videoconference. A mere exchange of letters, e-mails, or telephone calls does not satisfy the meet and confer requirement." AGT Civil Standing Order § VII.B.


The Court denies plaintiff's request for an additional reason: plaintiff made the request

in a unilateral discovery letter. The Court won't consider unilateral discovery letters. "If the parties are unable to resolve their dispute informally after a good-faith effort, including meet and confer efforts conducted by lead counsel, the parties shall prepare a joint statement . . . ."

*Id.*

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: July 6, 2023

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alex G. Tse  
United States Magistrate Judge